

REMARKS

Claims 45-50 were rejected under Section 103 based on the combination of Heo and Hakamada. It is respectfully submitted that Heo is not properly a reference against the present application. The present application was filed December 30, 1998, which is prior to the effective date of the American Inventor's Protection Act of 1999. Any new prior art created by the changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) may only be applied against applications that are filed on or after November 29, 2000, and against applications filed prior to November 29, 2000 that are pending on November 29, 2000 and are voluntarily published. See M.P.E.P. § 901.03, last paragraph. The present application was not published.

Therefore, Heo is not prior art.


In what is believed to be a typographical error, the claims were also rejected over a combination of Nielsen and Hakamada. But the discussion of Nielsen was clearly meant to apply to Heo. In other words, there is no second device 206 in Nielsen coupled to the first device and there is no highlight portion in Nielsen. Therefore, it is believed that the inclusion of paragraph 3 in the office action was inadvertent.

A check of the Patent Office database on line, indicates that the Heo reference has not matured into a patent. Beyond that, its status is not known.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation